

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

In the specification, the applicant has deleted the phrase "was used for mixing with antiferroelectric liquid crystal material."

Claims 12-14 remain in this application. Claims 1-7 and 8-11 have been deleted. Claims 15-25 have been added.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CLAIM REJECTION-35 U.S.C. SECTION 112 second paragraph

With respect to Page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 3 that were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraphs, because the specification, while being enabling for achiral swallow-tailed compound, mixed with an antiferroelectric liquid crystal, does not reasonably provide enablement for achiral swallow-tailed compound.

Examiner is of the opinion that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-7, thus, the rejection of Claim 3 can be withdrawn.

By the way, with regard to the specification, the application's disclosure provides enablement for the achiral swallow-tailed compound mixed with an antiferroelectric liquid crystal material. In the **specification, page 7, line 19 to page 8, line 5, "the achiral swallow-tailed compound,...and a well known antiferroelectric liquid crystal, is mixed to generate a binary ferroelectric liquid crystal mixture," is disclosed.** Thus, the application discloses the technique to generate the binary ferroelectric liquid crystal mixture from achiral swallow-tailed compound mixed with an antiferroelectric liquid crystal material. In addition, on page 8 of the specification, the unnecessary phrase "was used for mixing with antiferroelectric liquid crystal material" has been deleted. Thus, the specification is sufficient to allow one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

CLAIM REJECTION-35 U.S.C. SECTION 112 first paragraph

With respect to Page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraphs, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The applicant has deleted claims 4-7. Thus, the rejection is mute.

CLAIM REJECTION-35 U.S.C. SECTION 102(b)

With respect to Page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Wu et al (Liquid Crystals, 2002, Vol. 29, No. 1, 39-45). Of the rejected claims, only Claims 1 and 8 are independent.

The applicant has deleted Claims 1-2 and 4-7. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-11 is mute.

CLAIM REJECTION-35 U.S.C. SECTION 102(a)

With respect to Page 3 through Page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being anticipated by Wu et al (Liquid Crystals, 2003, Vol. 30, No. 2, 205-210). Of the rejected claims, only Claim 12 is independent.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 12 recited the steps "providing an achiral swallow-tailed compound" and "doping a ferroelectric liquid crystal material with said achiral swallow-tailed compound to...". Nevertheless, Wu et al (Liquid Crystals, 2003, Vol. 30, No. 2, 205-210) disclosed the chiral swallow-tailed liquid crystal has an antiferroelectric chiral smectic C phase property (col. 1, lines 7-11). In the disclosure of Wu et al (Liquid Crystals, 2003, Vol. 30, No. 2, 205-210) did not disclosed the chiral swallow-tailed compound is mixed with antiferroelectric liquid

crystal or ferroelectric liquid crystal. However, Wu et al (Liquid Crystals, 2003, Vol. 30, No. 2, 205-210) disclosed **“chrial swallow-tailed compound”** which differs from the **“achrial swallow-tailed compound”** as present invention recited. Thus, Wu et al (Liquid Crystals, 2003, Vol. 30, No. 2, 205-210) cannot anticipate the present invention.

Conclusion

In the light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims 12-14 and 15-25 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed that art cited but relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant has concluded that these references do not affect the patentability of these claims as currently presented. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

MR3029-76
Appl. No.10/602,866
Reply to Office action of April 14, 2004

**This Amendment was prepared by Applicant, and is being
submitted without substantive change by the undersigned
Attorney.**

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration No. 26,049

Dated: *13 July 2004*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
Tel: 410-465-6678

Customer No.
04586